REMARKS

Reconsideration of this application, as amended, is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-4, 6-14, 16-23, 25-31, 33-40, 42-45, 47-50, 52-55, 57, 59-61, 63-65, 67-69, 71-73 and 75-85 are pending. Claims 1-4, 6-14, 16-23, 25-31, 33-40, 42-45, 47-50, 52-55, 57, 59-61, 63-65, 67-69, 71-73 and 75-85 have been rejected.

Claims 1, 11, 20, 28, 37, 42, 47, 52, 57, 61, 65, 69, 73, 76, 79, 82, and 85 have been amended. No claims have been canceled. No claims have been added. Support for the amendments is found in the specification, the drawings, and in the claims as originally filed. Applicant submits that the amendments do not add new matter.

The Examiner rejected claims 1-4, 6-14, 16-23, 25-31, 33-40, 42-45, 47-50, 52-55, 57, 59-61, 63-65, 67-69, 71-73 and 75-85 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,628,303 B1 to Foreman ("Foreman") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,100,925 to Rosser et al. ("Rosser").

Amended claim 1 reads as follows:

> A method for collecting a time based stream of information in a processing system for generating a presentation, the method comprising:
>
> > A) communicating with an information source having a time based stream of information;
> >
> > B) presenting capture information from the time based stream of information on a portion of a first interface on a display while the capture information is acquired from the information source in a capture mode, the capture mode to import the time based stream of information into the system; and
> >
> > C) presenting on the first interface on the display at least one enabled control element, which is to control editing of the time based stream of information while presenting the capture information from the time based stream of information that is currently being imported into the system on the first interface without being edited.

(Amended claim 1) (emphasis added)

It is respectfully submitted that Foreman does not teach or suggest a combination with Rosser, and Rosser does not teach or suggest a combination with Foreman. It would be impermissible hindsight, based on Applicant's own disclosure, to combine Foreman and Rosser.

The Examiner acknowledged that "Foreman does not... teach the system is capable of editing the information while presenting the capture information from the time based stream of information that is currently being imported into the system." (Office Action, p. 5, 7/27/07).

Foreman teaches a graphical user interface for motion video planning and editing system for a computer (Abstract). More specifically, Foreman discloses one interface for capturing video that has display area 120 for displaying the video information that currently being received by the computer (Figures 4 and 8, col. 9, lines 20-35), and another interface (Figures 4, and 9-13) for editing.

Rosser, in contrast, teaches image insertion in video streams using a combination of physical sensors and pattern recognition. More specifically, Rosser discloses:

> Once the video has passed through LVIS 118 an indicia 136 is seamlessly and realistically inserted in the video stream. The insertion may be static, animated, or a live video feed from a separate video source 128. The resultant video signal is then sent via a suitable means 130, which may be satellite, aerial broadcast, or cable, to a home receiver 132 where the scene 135 with inserted indicia 136 is displayed on a conventional television set 134.

(Rosser, col. 15, lines 22-30)(emphasis added)

Thus, Rosser discloses inserting the image in the live video [editing the video] and displaying the scene with the inserted image [edited video].

Moreover, even if the graphical user interface of Foreman were combined with the image insertion in video streams of Rosser, such a combination would still lack presenting on the first

interface on the display at least one enabled control element to control editing of the time based stream of information while presenting the capture information from the time based stream of information that is currently being imported into the system on the first interface without being edited.

Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that amended claim 1 is not obvious under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Foreman in view of Rosser.

Given that claims 2-4, 6-14, 16-23, 25-31, 33-36, and 73-85 contain the limitations that are substantially similar to those discussed with respect to amended claim 1, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 2-4, 6-14, 16-23, 25-31, 33-36, and 73-85 are not obvious under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Foreman in view of Rosser.

Amended claim 37 reads as follows:

> A method for collecting a time based stream of information in a processing system for generating a presentation, the method comprising:
>
> > C) detecting a coupling with an information source having a time based stream of information in communication with the processing system, and
> >
> > D) automatically presenting capture information from the time based stream of information on a display in response to the detecting while the capture information is acquired from the information source in a capture mode, the capture mode to import the time based stream of information into the system, wherein the capture information is displayed at a first rate that is substantially the same as the transfer rate at which the time based stream of information arrives from the information source using an automatic interrupt procedure that iterates at a second rate that is not less than the transfer rate 30 frames per second at which the time based stream of information arrives from the information source.

(Amended claim 37) (emphasis added)

It is respectfully submitted that Foreman does not teach or suggest a combination with Rosser, and Rosser does not teach or suggest a combination with Foreman. It would be impermissible hindsight, based on Applicant's own disclosure, to combine Foreman and Rosser.

Foreman teaches a graphical user interface for motion video planning and editing system for a computer (Abstract). More specifically, Foreman discloses displaying the captured information that is currently being received directly into a timeline that represents a video program (col. 9, lines 20-32, col. 10, lines 27-33).

Rosser, in contrast, teaches image insertion in video streams using a combination of physical sensors and pattern recognition.

Moreover, even if the graphical user interface of Foreman were combined with the image insertion in video streams of Rosser, such a combination would still lack automatically presenting capture information from the time based stream of information on a display in response to the detecting while the capture information is acquired from the information source in a capture mode, the capture mode to import the time based stream of information into the system, wherein the capture information is displayed at a first rate that is substantially the same as the transfer rate at which the time based stream of information arrives from the information source using an automatic interrupt procedure that iterates at a second rate that is not less than the transfer rate 30 frames per second at which the time based stream of information arrives from the information source.

Therefore, applicant respectfully submits that amended claim 37 is not obvious under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Foreman in view of Rosser.

Given that claims 38-45, 47-50, 52-55, and 57-72 contain related limitations, applicant respectfully submits that claims 38-45, 47-50, 52-55, and 57-72 are not obvious under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Foreman in view of Rosser.

It is respectfully submitted that in view of the amendments and arguments set forth herein, the applicable rejections and objections have been overcome. If there are any additional charges, please charge Deposit Account No. 02-2666.

Respectfully submitted,

BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP

Date: Oct. 29, 2007

By: James C. Scheller
Reg. No. 31,195

1279 Oakmead Parkway
Sunnyvale, California 94085-4040
(408) 720-8300
Fax (408) 720-8383

Customer No. 008791